arXiv:1110.6187v1 [math.PR] 27 Oct 2011

Convexification in the limit and strong law of large numbers for closed-valued random sets in Banach spaces

Francesco S. de Blasi[1] Luca Tomassini[2]

1. Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”, Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy, e-mail: deblasi@mat.uniroma2.it
2. Dipartimento di Scienze, Università di Chieti-Pescara G. d’Annunzio, I-65127, e-mail: tomassini@sci.unich.it

1 Introduction

The study of the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) for compact-valued random sets was started by Artstein and Vitale [2], with their seminal 1975 paper. Ever since, significant extensions and developments have been obtained by several authors, including Puri and Ralescu [19, 20], Cressie [6], Hess [8, 9], Artstein and Hansen [1], Hiai [10], Terán and Molchanov [23]. A systematic presentation of the status of the theory and the multivalued analysis prerequisites can be found in the monographs of Molchanov [16], Hu and Papageorgiou [12] and Castaing and Valadier [5].

In the SLLN for compact-valued random sets, it is somehow natural to investigate convergence in the sense of the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h. This type of convergence does not seem to be appropriate for random sets which are merely bounded and closed-valued and thus, in this case, the SLLN has been studied by using weaker modes of convergence, like Wijsman’s convergence [24] or Mosco’s convergence [17, 4].

In the present paper we consider a SLLN for random sets with bounded and closed values contained in an arbitrary (not necessarily separable) Banach space and, in this context, we shall use a notion of convergence, namely Fisher’s convergence, which is stronger than Wijsman’s convergence but in general not comparable with Mosco’s convergence.

More precisely, denote by $\mathbb{E}$ an arbitrary real Banach space and by $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ (resp. $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$) the space of all nonempty bounded closed (resp. nonempty bounded closed and convex) subsets of $\mathbb{E}$ endowed with the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h. Let $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, P)$ be a complete probability space without atoms and let $\mathfrak{U}$ be a closed and separable subset of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ be a sequence of independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random sets $X_n : \Omega \to \mathfrak{U}$. If, in addition, for $\omega \in \Omega$ almost surely (a.s.) the sequence $\{X_n(\omega)\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is compact in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, then it is shown

(Theorem 6.2) that

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega) + \cdots + X_n(\omega)}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega. \tag{1.1}$$

Here the convergence is in the sense of Fisher, and $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is the expectation of X_1. Moreover, if C is compact, the convergence in (1.1) is in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h.

To prove the above result, we first consider the corresponding sequence of random sets $\{\overline{co}X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ and, using the Rådström's embedding theorem, we show (Theorem 6.1) that

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{co}X_1(\omega) + \cdots + \overline{co}X_n(\omega)}{n}} \xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega,$$

where the convergence is in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h. Hence, a fortiori,

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{co}X_1(\omega) + \cdots + \overline{co}X_n(\omega)}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega, \tag{1.2}$$

From this, by virtue of a convexification in the limit result (Theorem 4.1), it follows that

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega) + \cdots + X_n(\omega)}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

and thus (1.1) is valid.

We observe that the precompactness of $\{X_n(\omega)\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is actually required in order to deduce (1.3) from (1.2). Furthermore, it is worth noting that the separability of $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ does not imply that the set $U = \cup\{X \mid X \in \mathcal{U}\}$ be separable in $\mathbb{E}$ and, similarly, the compactness of the sequence $\{X_n(\omega)\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ does not imply that the set $V = \cup\{X_n(\omega) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be precompact in $\mathbb{E}$. To see this it suffices to consider $\mathcal{U} = \{\overline{B}\}$ and $X_n(\omega) = \overline{B}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\overline{B}$ is the closed unit ball of an infinite dimensional non-separable Banach space.

The present paper is organized into six sections, including the Introduction. Section 2 contains notations and preliminaries. In Section 3 we review some elementary properties of various notions of convergence in spaces of sets. In Sections 4 we establish a convexification in the limit result for Fisher convergent sequences of sets in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. In Section 5 we introduce a notion of expectation for random sets with values in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, where the underlying Banach space $\mathbb{E}$ is not necessarily separable. Finally in Section 6 we present two versions of the SLLN, with Fisher-type convergence, for i.i.d. random sets with values in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ and $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ respectively.

2 Notation and preliminaries

Let M be a metric space with distance d_M. For $Z \subset M$, we denote by $B_M(a,r)$ and $B_M[a,r]$ an open and a closed ball in M with centre a and radius r. For any $Z \subset M$, $\overline{Z}$ stands for the closure of Z in M. If $a \in M$ and Z is a nonempty subset of M, we set $d_M(a,Z) = \inf\{d_M(a,z) \mid z \in Z\}$. The Pompeiu-Hausdorff distance $h_M(X,Y)$ between two nonempty bounded sets $X, Y \subset M$ is defined by

$$h_M(X,Y) = \max\{e_M(X,Y), e_M(Y,X)\}$$

where $e_M(X,Y) = \sup\{d_M(x,Y) \mid x \in X\}$ and $e_M(Y,X) = \sup\{d_M(y,X) \mid y \in Y\}$.

Throughout the present paper $\mathbb{E}$ is a real Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|$. The open (resp. closed) unit ball with centre at the origin of $\mathbb{E}$ are denoted by $B_{\mathbb{E}}$ (resp. $\overline{B_{\mathbb{E}}}$). Moreover coX and $\overline{co}X$ stand for the convex hull and the closed convex hull of a set $X \subset \mathbb{E}$. For any nonempty sets $X, Y \subset \mathbb{E}$ and $\lambda \geqslant 0$ the *sum* $X + Y$ and the *product* λX are given by

$$X + Y = \{x + y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}, \qquad \lambda X = \{\lambda X \mid x \in X\}.$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E}) &= \{X \subset \mathbb{E} \mid X \text{ is nonempty bounded}\}\\ \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}) &= \{X \subset \mathbb{E} \mid X \text{ is nonempty closed bounded}\}\\ \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) &= \{X \subset \mathbb{E} \mid X \text{ is nonempty closed convex bounded}\}.\end{aligned}$$

It is worth noting that in each of the above spaces the Pompeiu-Hausdorff distance $h_{\mathbb{E}}(X,Y)$ between two sets X, Y is given, equivalently, by

$$h_{\mathbb{E}}(X,Y) = \inf_{r>0}\{X \subset Y + rB, Y \subset X + rB\}.$$

The spaces $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ and $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ are equipped with the Pompeiu-Hausdorff distance $h_{\mathbb{E}}$, under which each one of them is a complete metric space. On the other hand, $h_{\mathbb{E}}$ is a pseudometric on $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ since $h_{\mathbb{E}}(X,Y) = 0$, where $X, Y \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$, does not imply $X = Y$. For $X \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ we set $\|X\| = \sup\{\|x\| \mid x \in X\}$.

For a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ and $X \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ we shall consider the following notions of convergence.

Definition 2.1. The sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is said to converge to X in the *sense of Pompeiu-Hausdorff* (we write $X_n \xrightarrow{h} X$) if $\lim_{n\to+\infty} h(X_n, X) = 0$.

Definition 2.2. The sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is said to converge to X in the *sense of Fisher* (we write $X_n \xrightarrow{F} X$) if

(a_1) $\lim_{n\to+\infty} e_{\mathbb{E}}(X_n, X) = 0$

(a_2) $\lim_{n\to+\infty} d_{\mathbb{E}}(z, X_n) = 0$ for every $z \in \mathbb{E}$.

Definition 2.3. The sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is said to converge to X in the *sense of Wijsman* (we write $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$) if

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} d_{\mathbb{E}}(z, X_n) = d_{\mathbb{E}}(z, X) \qquad \text{for every } z \in X.$$

Remark 2.1. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ and $X \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ be given. If γ denotes any one of the above modes of convergence, *i.e.*, convergence in the sense of Pompeiu-Hausdorff, Fisher or Wijsman, then we have

$$X_n \xrightarrow{\gamma} X \Longleftrightarrow \overline{X}_n \xrightarrow{\gamma} \overline{X} \Longleftrightarrow X_n \xrightarrow{\gamma} \overline{X} \Longleftrightarrow \overline{X}_n \xrightarrow{\gamma} X.$$

In what follows, when the role of the underlying metric space is evident and clarity is not affected, we will drop subscripts and write $d, e, h, B(a,r), B, \ldots$ instead of $d_{\mathbb{E}}, e_{\mathbb{E}}, h_{\mathbb{E}}, B_{\mathbb{E}}(a,r), B_{\mathbb{E}}, \ldots$.

3 Auxiliary results

In this section we review a few elementary properties of convergent sequences of sets which will be useful in what follows. Some of them could be easily deduced from results contained in [4]. Yet, for the sake of completeness proofs are included.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ *and* $X \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$*. Then* $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$ *if and only if:*

(i) for each $z \in X$*,* $\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(z, X_n) = 0$ *(equivalently there exists a sequence* $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{E}$*, with* $x_n \in X_n$*, such that* $x_n \to z$ *as* $n \to +\infty$*).*

(ii) for each $z \notin X$*, given* $0 < \epsilon < d(z, X)$*, there exists* $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$X_n \cap B(z, d(z, X) - \epsilon) = \varnothing \quad \textit{for all } \ n \geqslant n_0.$$

Proof. Suppose that $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$. Then (i) is obvious. Arguing by contradiction, suppose that (ii) is not valid. Then for some $z \notin X$ there exist $0 < \epsilon < d(z, X)$ and a subsequence $\{X_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ such that $X_{n_k} \cap B(z, d(z, X) - \epsilon) \neq \varnothing$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $d(z, X_{n_k}) < d(z, X) - \epsilon$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a contradiction, as $d(z, X_n) \to d(z, X)$ for $n \to +\infty$.

Suppose that (i) and (ii) are satisfied. We want to show that, for every $z \in \mathbb{E}$

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(z, X_n) = d(z, X) \tag{3.1}$$

This is obvious if $z \in X$, in view of (i). Let $z \notin X$ and, arguing by contradiction, suppose that (3.1) does not hold. Then there exist $0 < \epsilon < d(z, X)$ and a subsequence $\{X_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ for which one of the following is valid:

$$d(z, X_{n_k}) \leqslant d(z, X) - \epsilon \qquad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.2}$$

$$d(z, X_{n_k}) \geqslant d(z, X) + \epsilon \qquad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.3}$$

Consider (3.2). By virtue of (ii) there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_n \cap B(z, d(z, X) - \epsilon/2) = \varnothing$ for all $n_{k_0} \geqslant n_0$. Hence $d(z, X_n) < d(z, X) - \epsilon/2$ for every $n \geqslant n_0$ and thus for some $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_{k_0} \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$d(z, X_{n_k}) \geqslant d(z, X) - \epsilon/2 \qquad \text{for every } k \geqslant k_0,$$

a contradiction to (3.2).

Consider (3.3). Clearly $d(z, X_{n_k}) > d(z, X) + \epsilon/2$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and thus

$$X_{n_k} \cap B(z, d(z, X) + \epsilon/2) = \varnothing \qquad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now fix $x \in X$ so that $\|z - x\| < d(z, X) + \epsilon/2$. In view of (i) there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$, with $x_n \in X_n$, such that $x_n \to x$ an $n \to +\infty$. Hence for n large enough, say $n \geqslant n_0$, we have $\|z - x_n\| < d(z, X) + \epsilon/2$ and thus, a fortiori, $d(z, X_n) < d(z, X) + \epsilon/2$ for every $n \geqslant n_0$. Taking $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $n_{k_0} \geqslant n_0$, we have that

$$d(z, X_{n_k}) < d(z, X) + \epsilon/2 \qquad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

a contradiction to (3.3). Consequently (3.1) holds thus completing the proof. ☐

Remark 3.1. In view of Proposition 3.1 we have that if a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ converges in the sense of Wijsman to $X \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, then this limit is unique.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ *and let* $X \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. *Then*

$$X_n \xrightarrow{h} X \Rightarrow X_n \xrightarrow{F} X \Rightarrow X_n \xrightarrow{W} X.$$

Proof. Suppose that $X_n \xrightarrow{F} X$. Then both conditions (a_1) and (a_2) of Definition 2.2 are trivially satisfied since, from the assumption, $e(X_n, X) \to 0$ and $e(X, X_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \mathbb{N}$. Hence $X_n \xrightarrow{F} X$.

Suppose that $X_n \xrightarrow{F} X$. To prove that $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$ it suffices to show that both conditions (i) and (ii) of Proposition 3.1 are satisfied. It is obvious that (i) holds. Arguing by contradiction, suppose that (ii) does not. Then, for some $z \notin X$ and some $0 < \epsilon < d(z, X)$, there is a subsequence $\{X_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ such that $X_{n_k} \cap B(z, d(z, X) - \epsilon) \neq \varnothing$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus

$$d(z, X_{n_k}) < d(z, X) - \epsilon \qquad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.4}$$

As $e(X_{n_k}, X) \to 0$ for $k \to +\infty$, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_{n_{k_0}} \subset X + \epsilon B/2$. By the latter and (3.4) it follows that

$$d(z, X) - \epsilon/2 \leqslant d(z, X + \epsilon B/2) \leqslant d(z, X_{n_{k_0}}) < d(z, X) - \epsilon,$$

a contradiction. Hence also (ii) is valid and thus $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$ thus completing the proof. ☐

Remark 3.2. The following examples show that the Pompeiu-Hausdorff convergence is stronger than Fisher's convergence and that the latter is in turn stronger than Wijsman's convergence.

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a real infinite dimensional Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\| \cdot \|$. Let $S = \{x \in \mathbb{H} \mid \|x\| = 1\}$ and $\overline{B} = \{x \in \mathbb{H} \mid \|x\| \leqslant 1\}$. Let us show that for each $0 < r < 1$ there exists an infinite sequence $\{e_n\} \subset S$ such that

$$\|e_n - e_m\| \geqslant r \qquad\qquad \text{for all } n, m \in \mathbb{N}, m \neq n. \tag{3.5}$$

Let $e_1 \in S$. Evidently $S \backslash \overline{B}(e_1, r) \neq \varnothing$ and thus there exists an element $e_2 \in S$ such that $\|e_2 - e_1\| > r$. Observe that

$$S \backslash (\overline{B}(e_1, r) \cup \overline{B}(e_2, r)) \neq \varnothing \tag{3.6}$$

In the contrary case $S \subset \{e_1, e_2\} + r\overline{B} \subset \mathrm{co}\{e_1, e_2\} + r\overline{B}$ and thus $\overline{B} \subset \mathrm{co}\{e_1, e_2\} + r\overline{B}$ which, by Rådström cancellation law [21], implies that $(1 - r)\overline{B} \subset \mathrm{co}\{e_1, e_2\}$. This is a contradiction, as $\mathbb{H}$ is infinite dimensional. Since (3.6) holds, there exists an element, say $e_3 \in S$, such that $\|e_3 - e_1\| > r$ and $\|e_3 - e_2\| > r$. Thus, by induction, one can construct a sequence $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset S$ satisfying (3.5).

Example 3.1. The sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{H})$ defined by $X_n = \mathrm{co}\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfies

$$X_n \xrightarrow{F} X \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_n \overset{h}{\nrightarrow} X \tag{3.7}$$

where $X = \overline{\mathrm{co}} E$ and $E = \{e_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$.

Clearly $X_n \subset X_{n+1} \subset X$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence $e(X_n, X) = 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(z, X_n) = 0 \qquad \text{for each} \qquad z \in X,$$

because, given $\epsilon > 0$, for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $d(z, X_{n_0}) < \epsilon$ and thus, a fortiori, $d(z, X_n) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geqslant n_0$. Therefore $X_n \xrightarrow{F} X$. On the other hand, if $X_n \overset{h}{\to} X$ then, denoting by α the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness [14], we have $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \alpha(X_n) = \alpha(X)$. As $\alpha(X) = 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $\alpha(X) = 0$, *i.e.*, X is compact. This impossible since, in view of (3.5), the sequence $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset X$ does not contain convergent subsequences. Consequently $X_n \overset{h}{\nrightarrow} X$.

Example 3.2. Let $E = \{e_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset S$ be as in the previous example. Thus $\{e_n\}$ satisfies (3.5) for some $0 < r < 1$. Fix $1 < \lambda < 2/\sqrt{4 - r^2}$. Then the sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{H})$ defined by $X_n = \overline{\text{co}}\{\lambda e_n, \overline{B}\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfies

$$X_n \xrightarrow{W} \overline{B} \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_n \overset{F}{\nrightarrow} \overline{B}. \tag{3.8}$$

Let us show that $X_n \xrightarrow{W} \overline{B}$. Set $\rho = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 1}$. Clearly

$$B(\lambda e_n, \rho) \cap \overline{B} \neq \varnothing \qquad\qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.9}$$

since $\|\lambda e_n - e_n\| = \lambda - 1 < \rho$. Moreover,

$$B\,[\lambda e_i, \rho] \cap B\,[\lambda e_j, \rho] = \varnothing \qquad\qquad \text{for every } i \neq j \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.10}$$

because for arbitrary $z \in B\,[\lambda e_i, \rho]$ and $z' \in B\,[\lambda e_j, \rho]$ one has

$$\|z - z'\| = \|\lambda(e_i - e_j) + (z - \lambda e_i) - (z' - \lambda e_j)\| \geqslant \lambda\|e_i - e_j\| - 2\rho \geqslant \lambda r - 2\sqrt{\lambda^2 - 1} > 0.$$

Furthermore, let us prove that for every $e_n \in E$

$$y \in S \backslash B\,[\lambda e_n, \rho] \quad \Rightarrow \quad X_n \subset \{x \in \mathbb{H} \parallel \langle x - y, y\rangle \leqslant 0\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Indeed, let $y \in S$ satisfy $\|y - \lambda e_n\| > \rho$. This implies that $\langle \lambda e_n, y\rangle < 1$. Since for each $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \overline{B}$,

$$\langle (1-t)\lambda e_n + tz - y, y\rangle = (1-t)\langle \lambda e_n, y\rangle + t\langle z, y\rangle - \|y\|^2 \leqslant (1-t) + t - 1 = 0,$$

it follows that each point of X_n is contained in the half space $\{x \in \mathbb{H} \mid \langle x - y, y\rangle \leqslant 0\}$, and thus (3.11) is valid.

We are now ready to prove that for every $z \in \mathbb{H}$

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(z, X_n) = d(z, \overline{B}). \tag{3.12}$$

Let $z \in \mathbb{H} \backslash \overline{B}$ be arbitrary (if $z \in \overline{B}$ there is nothing to prove) and denote by y the point at which the closed linear segment tz $(0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1)$ meets S. In view of (3.10) one (and only one) of the following cases occurs:

(j) $y \in B\,[\lambda e_k, \rho]$ for some $e_k \in E$ (any such e_k is unique by (3.10).

(jj) $y \notin B\,[\lambda e_n, \rho]$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Consider (j). Then by (3.10), $y \notin B[\lambda e_n, \rho]$ for every $n \neq k$ and hence by (3.11)

$$X_n \subset \{x \in \mathbb{H} \mid \langle x - y, y\rangle \leqslant 0\} \qquad \text{for every } n \neq k.$$

The latter implies that $d(z, X_n) \geqslant \|z - y\|$ since $y \in X_n$. As $d(z, \overline{B}) = \|z - y\|$, it follows that

$$d(z, X_n) = d(z, \overline{B}) \qquad \text{for every } n \neq k,$$

and thus (3.12) holds.
Consider (jj). Then by (3.11),

$$X_n \subset \{x \in \mathbb{H} \mid \langle x - y, y\rangle \leqslant 0\} \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and as before one can show that (3.12) holds. Therefore $X_n \xrightarrow{W} \overline{B}$. On the other hand $X_n \overset{F}{\nrightarrow} \overline{B}$ because, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $e(X_n, \overline{B}) = \|\lambda e_n - e_n\| = \lambda - 1 > 0$. This completes the proof of (3.7).

Proposition 3.3. *Let* $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}, \{Y_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ *satisfy* $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$ *and* $Y_n \xrightarrow{W} Y$ *for some* $X, Y \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$. *Let* $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}, \{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset [0, +\infty)$ *be such that* $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ *and* $m_n \to \mu$ *for some* $\lambda, \mu \geqslant 0$. *Then*

$$\overline{\lambda_n X_n + \mu_n Y_n} \quad \xrightarrow{F} \quad \overline{\lambda X + \mu Y}. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. From the assumption, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_n \subset X + \epsilon B$ and $Y_n \subset Y + \epsilon B$ for every $n \geqslant n_0$. Then for all n large enough we have

$$\lambda_n X_n + \mu_n Y_n \subset \lambda_n X + \mu_n Y + \epsilon(\lambda_n + \mu_n)B \subset \lambda X + \mu Y + \epsilon(\lambda + \mu + 1)B$$

which shows that

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} e(\lambda_n X_n + \mu_n Y_n, \lambda X + \mu Y) = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Let $z \in \lambda X + \mu Y$ be arbitrary, thus $z = \lambda x + \mu y$ for some $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. As $X_n \xrightarrow{F} X$ and $Y_n \xrightarrow{F} Y$, there exists two sequences $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}, \{y_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ with $x_n \in X_n$ and $y_n \in Y_n$ such that $x_n \to x$ and $y_n \to y$ as $n \to +\infty$. Set $z_n = \lambda_n x_n + \mu_n y_n$ and observe that $z_n \in \lambda_n X_n + \mu_n Y_n$ and $z_n \to z$. Clearly $d(z, \lambda_n X_n + \mu_n Y_n) \leqslant \|z - z_n\|$ and thus

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} d(z, \lambda_n X_n + \mu_n Y_n) = 0 \qquad \text{for every } z \in X + Y. \tag{3.15}$$

The statement (3.13) is an immediate consequence of (3.14), (3.15) and Remark 2.1. This completes the proof. ☐

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}, \{Y_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ *and let* $X, Y \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. *Suppose that* $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$ *and* $Y_n \xrightarrow{W} Y$ *as* $n \to +\infty$ *and* $h(X_n, Y_n) < r$ *for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $r > 0$. *Then,* $h(X, Y) \leqslant r$.

Proof. Arguing by contradiction, suppose that for some $\theta > 0$, $h(X,Y) > r + \theta$ and to fix ideas let $e(X,Y) > r + \theta$ (the argument is similar if $e(Y,X) > r + \theta$). Fix an $x \in X$ satisfying

$$d(x,Y) > r + \theta. \tag{3.16}$$

Now $x \in X$ and $X_n \xrightarrow{W} X$, hence, by Proposition 3.1, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$, with $x_n \in X_n$, such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to +\infty$. On the other hand, $x \notin Y$ by (3.16) and $Y_n \xrightarrow{W} Y$ and thus, by Proposition 3.1, given $0 < \epsilon < \theta/3$ there exists $n_1 > n_0$ such that

$$Y_n \cap B(x, d(x,Y) - \epsilon) = \varnothing \quad \text{for every } \ n \geqslant n_0. \tag{3.17}$$

From (3.16), as $x_n \to x$, it follows that there exists $n_1 \geqslant n_0$ such that

$$d(x_n, Y) > r + \theta \quad \text{for every } \ n \geqslant n_1. \tag{3.18}$$

Take $n_2 > n_1$ such that $\|x_n - x\| \leqslant \epsilon$ and $|d(x_n Y) - d(x,Y)| < \epsilon$ for every $n_1 \geqslant n_2$. Hence

$$B(x_n, d(x_n, Y) - 3\epsilon) \subset B(x, d(x,Y) - \epsilon) \quad \text{for every } \ n \geqslant n_2,$$

and thus by (3.17)

$$Y_n \cap B(x_n, d(x_n, Y) - 3\epsilon) = \varnothing \quad \text{for every } \ n \geqslant n_2. \tag{3.19}$$

Now fix $n \geqslant n_2$. Then by virtue of (3.19) and (3.18) one has

$$d(x_n, Y_n) \geqslant d(x_n, Y) - 3\epsilon > r + \theta - 3\epsilon.$$

Since on the other hand $d(x_n, Y_n) \leqslant e(X_n, Y_n) \leqslant h(X_n, Y_n) < r$, it follows that $r > r + \theta - 3\epsilon$. This is a contradiction, for $0 < \epsilon < \theta/3$. Therefore $h(X,Y) \leqslant r$, which completes the proof. ☐

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ be a nonempty compact set in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $\{Z_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ and let $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ be compact. Then,*

$$Z_n \xrightarrow{W} C \quad \Rightarrow \quad Z_n \xrightarrow{h} C.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $n', n'' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following properties (j) and (jj) are satisfied:

(j) $\quad C \subset Z_n + \epsilon B \quad$ for every $n \geqslant n'$

(jj) $\quad Z_n \subset C + \epsilon B \quad$ for every $n \geqslant n''$

Consider (j). By hypothesis $Z_n \xrightarrow{W} C$ and hence, by Proposition 3.1, for each $u \in C$ there exist $n_u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(u, Z_n) < \epsilon/2$ for every $n \geqslant n_u$. Since $d(x, Z_n) \leqslant \|x - u\| + d(u, Z_n)$, it follows that $d(x, Z_n) < \epsilon$ for every $x \in B(u, \epsilon/2)$ and $n \geqslant n_u$. Now, $\{B(u, \epsilon/2)\}_{u \in C}$ is an open covering of C, a compact set, hence it admits a finite subcovering, *i.e.*, for some $u_1, \ldots, u_d \in C$ we have

$$C \subset B(u_1, \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \cup \cdots \cup B(u_d, \frac{\epsilon}{2}).$$

Set $n' = \max\{n_{u_1}, \dots, n_{u_d}\}$. Since each $x \in C$ is in some ball $B(u_i, \epsilon/2)$, with $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$, we have $d(x, Z_n) < \epsilon$ for every $n \geqslant n'$. Consequently $C \subset Z_n + \epsilon B$ for every $n \geqslant n'$ and (j) holds.

Consider (jj). Arguing by contradiction, suppose that (jj) does not hold. Then there exists a subsequence $\{Z_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ such that

$$Z_{n_k} \not\subset C + \epsilon B \qquad \text{for every } \; k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.20}$$

As $\{Z_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{Z}$, where $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is compact in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, there exists a subsequence $\{Z_{n_{k_j}}\}_{j=1}^{+\infty}$ and a set $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that $Z_{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{h} Z$ as $j \to +\infty$. From this and (3.20) it follows that $Z \not\subset C + (\epsilon/2)B$ and hence, for some $z \in Z$, we have $d(z, C) \geqslant \epsilon/2$. Since $z \in Z$ and $Z_{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{h} Z$, there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$Z_{n_{k_j}} \cap B(z, \frac{\epsilon}{8}) \neq \varnothing \qquad \text{for all } \; j \geqslant j_0. \tag{3.21}$$

On the other hand, $z \notin C$ and $Z_{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{W} C$, and thus by Proposition 3.1 there exists $j_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$Z_{n_{k_j}} \cap B(z, d(z, C) - \frac{\epsilon}{4}) = \varnothing \qquad \text{for all } \; j \geqslant j_1. \tag{3.22}$$

Let $j = \max\{j_0, j_1\}$. Then by (3.21) and (3.22)

$$d(z, Z_{n_{k_j}}) < \frac{\epsilon}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad d(z, Z_{n_{k_j}}) \geqslant d(z, C) - \frac{\epsilon}{4},$$

which yields a contradiction since $d(z, C) \geqslant \epsilon/2$. Hence also (jj) holds and this completes the proof. □

For $\mathcal{Z}$ a nonempty subset of $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ define

$$\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z} = \{Y \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid Y = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i X_i}, \text{ where } X_i \in \mathcal{Z}, \lambda_i \in [0,1] \text{ with } \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i = 1, n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Further, we denote by $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$ the closure of $\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}$ in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric of $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. The set $\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}$ is convex, *i.e.*, $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}$ implies that $\overline{(1-\lambda)Y_1 + \lambda Y_2} \in \mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}$ for every $\lambda \in [0,1]$. Clearly the set $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$ is also convex.

Proposition 3.6 ((Mazur's Theorem))**.** *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a nonempty compact subset of $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric of $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. Then the set $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[co\mathcal{Z}]$ is compact and convex.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$ is compact. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By hypothesis $\mathcal{Z}$ is compact and thus it admits a finite $\epsilon/2$-net $\{A_1, \dots, A_p\} \subset \mathcal{Z}$. Let $\Delta = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid \alpha_i \in [0,1], \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_p = 1\}$. Define $\Phi : \Delta \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ by

$$\Phi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \alpha_i A_i} \qquad\qquad (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) \in \Delta,$$

and set $\mathcal{R} = \Phi(\Delta)$. Evidently $\mathcal{R}$ is compact and thus it admits a finite $\epsilon/2$-net $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_q\} \subset \mathcal{R}$. We want to show that $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_q\}$ is an ϵ-net of co$\mathcal{Z}$. Indeed let $X \in \mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}$ be arbitrary, and thus

$$X = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i X_i},$$

for some $X_i \in \mathcal{Z}$, $\lambda_i \in [0,1]$ with $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n = 1$. As $\{A_1, \ldots, A_p\}$ is an $\epsilon/2$-net of $\mathcal{Z}$, one has that each X_i, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, is contained in some ball, say $B(A_i', \epsilon/2)$, for some $A_i' \in \{A_1, \ldots, A_p\}$. Set

$$Y = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i A_i'}.$$

Clearly $h(X,Y) < \epsilon/2$. Moreover, $Y \in \mathcal{R}$ because for some $\alpha_i \in [0,1]$ with $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_p = 1$ we have

$$Y = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \alpha_i A_i}.$$

Since $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_q\}$ is an $\epsilon/2$-net of $\mathcal{R}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{R}$, it follows that $Y \in B(Y_j, \epsilon/2)$ for some $1 \leqslant j \leqslant q$. Whence $X \in B(Y_j, \epsilon/2)$, for $h(X, Y_j) \leqslant h(X,Y) + h(Y, Y_j) < \epsilon$. As $X \in \mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_q\}$ is an ϵ-net of co$\mathcal{Z}$ and hence also for $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$. Hence $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$ is totally bounded. Furthermore $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$ is complete since it is closed in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$, a complete metric space. Consequently $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathrm{co}\mathcal{Z}]$ is compact, completing the proof. ☐

4 Convexification in the limit results

In this section we prove some convexification in the limit results which turn out to be useful for the proof of the SLLN for $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$-valued random sets.

For any set $D \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$D[n] = \frac{\overbrace{D + \cdots + D}^{n-\text{times}}}{n}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $C \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Then*

$$\overline{C[n]} \xrightarrow{F} \overline{\mathrm{co}}C \qquad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Denote by $\mathbb{Q}^+$ the set of positive rationals $\rho \geqslant 0$. Define

$$Q = \{x \in \mathrm{co}C \mid x = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \rho_i x_i, \text{ where } x_i \in C, \rho_i \in \mathbb{Q}^+, \text{ with } \sum_{i=}^{d} \rho_i = 1, d \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

and observe that $Q \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$ and $\overline{Q} = \overline{\mathrm{co}}C$.

Indeed let $z \in Q$ be arbitrary. Then, for some $x_1, \ldots, x_d \in C$ and $p_1, \ldots, p_d \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$z = \frac{p_1}{p} x_1 + \cdots + \frac{p_d}{p} x_d \qquad \text{where} \qquad p_1 + \cdots + p_d = p.$$

Moreover

$$z \in C[n], \qquad \text{for every } \ n \in \mathcal{J} = \{p, 2p, \dots, kp, \dots\}$$

because for each $n \in \mathcal{J}$, say $n = kp$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{kp_1 x_1 + \cdots + kp_d x_d}{kp} \\ &= \frac{\overbrace{x_1 + \cdots + x_1}^{kp_1-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{x_d + \cdots + x_d}^{kp_d-\text{times}}}{kp} \\ &\in \frac{\overbrace{C + \cdots + C}^{kp-\text{times}}}{kp} = C[n]. \end{aligned}$$

Claim. There exists a sequence $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{E}$ satisfying the following properties:

$$c_n = z \qquad \text{if } \ n = kp \ \text{ for } \ k = 1, 2, \dots \tag{4.2}$$

$$c_n \in C[n] \qquad \text{for every } \ n \geqslant p \tag{4.3}$$

$$c_n \to z \qquad \text{as } \ n \to +\infty \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed fix $c \in C$ and define the sequence $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ as follows

$$c_n = \begin{cases} z & \text{if } \ n = kp, \ k \in \mathbb{N} \\ \dfrac{\overbrace{x_1 + \cdots + x_1}^{kp_1-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{x_d + \cdots + x_d}^{kp_d-\text{times}} + \overbrace{c + \cdots + c}^{j-\text{times}}}{kp+j} & \text{if } \ n = kp + j, \ k \in \mathbb{N} \\ & \quad j = 1, \dots, p-1. \end{cases}$$

Clearly for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ we have $c_{kp} \in C[kp]$ and $c_{kp+j} \in C[kp+j]$. It is evident that the sequence $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ satisfies (4.2) and (4.3). Furthermore, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{kp+j} - z &= \frac{\overbrace{x_1 + \cdots + x_1}^{kp_1-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{x_d + \cdots + x_d}^{kp_d-\text{times}} + \overbrace{c + \cdots + c}^{j-\text{times}}}{kp+j} \\ &\quad - \frac{\overbrace{x_1 + \cdots + x_1}^{kp_1-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{x_d + \cdots + x_d}^{kp_d-\text{times}}}{kp} \\ &= \frac{kp}{kp+j} \frac{\overbrace{x_1 + \cdots + x_1}^{kp_1-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{x_d + \cdots + x_d}^{kp_d-\text{times}}}{kp} + \frac{j}{n+j} c \\ - \frac{\overbrace{x_1 + \cdots + x_1}^{kp_1-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{x_d + \cdots + x_d}^{kp_d-\text{times}}}{kp} &= \left(\frac{kp}{kp+j} - 1 \right) z + \frac{j}{kp+j} c \end{aligned}$$

From the latter, letting $k \to +\infty$ it follows that $c_{kp+j} \to z$. This and (4.2)imply that $c_n \to z$ as $n \to +\infty$. Hence also (4.2) is satisfied and the Claim is proved.

Now we are in position to complete the proof of Proposition 4.1. Evidently $e(C[n], \overline{\mathrm{co}}C) = 0$, since $C[n] \subset \overline{\mathrm{co}}C$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by the Claim $\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(z, C[n]) = 0$. As $z \in Q$ is arbitrary, it follows that $C[n] \xrightarrow{F} Q$ as $n \to +\infty$. Hence $\overline{C[n]} \xrightarrow{F} \overline{Q}$, *i.e.*, $\overline{C[n]} \xrightarrow{F} \overline{\mathrm{co}C}$ as $n \to +\infty$. Thus (4.1) is valid and the proof is complete. □

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ be a nonempty compact set in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ and let $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. Then*

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty$$

implies

$$\overline{\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The statement is proved if we show:

- *(j)* $\lim_{n\to+\infty} e((X_1 + \cdots + X_n)/n, C) = 0$
- *(jj)* $\lim_{n\to+\infty} d\,(z, (X_1 + \cdots + X_n)/n) = 0$ for each $z \in C$.

The fact that (j) holds is obvious, since for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$e\left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n}, C\right) \leqslant e\left(\frac{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n}{n}, C\right),$$

and the right hand side vanishes as $n \to +\infty$.

Let us prove (jj). Arguing by contradiction, suppose that (jj) does not hold. Then for some $z \in C$ there exists $\theta > 0$ and a subsequence $\{(X_1 + \cdots + X_{n_k})/n_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ such that

$$d\left(z, \frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_{n_k}}{n_k}\right) \geqslant \theta \qquad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.6}$$

Let $0 < \epsilon < \theta/8$. Since $\mathcal{Z}$ is compact in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, it admits a finite ϵ-net, say $\{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_d\} \subset \mathcal{Z}$, for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We now associate to the given sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ another sequence $\{C'_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ constructed with the following procedure. Consider the ordered set of balls

$$\{B(C_1, \epsilon), B(C_2, \epsilon), \ldots, B(C_d, \epsilon)\}.$$

Then for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by C'_n the centre of the ball $B(C_i, \epsilon)$, where i is the smallest index $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$ such that $X_n \in B(C_i, \epsilon)$. Clearly $h(C'_n, X_n) < \epsilon$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, we associate to $\{(X_1 + \cdots + X_{n_k})/n_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ the following sequence:

$$\left\{\frac{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_k}}{n_k}\right\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}. \tag{4.7}$$

Claim 1. There exists a subsequence $\{(C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}})/n_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^{+\infty}$ of (4.7) and there is a set $\Gamma \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ given by $\Gamma = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_i}$, for some $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d \geqslant 0$ with $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_d = 1$, such that:

$$\overline{\frac{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}} \xrightarrow{F} \Gamma \qquad \text{as } j \to +\infty \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\frac{\overline{\overline{\mathrm{co}}C_1' + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}}C_{n_{k_j}}'}}{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{h} \Gamma \qquad \text{as } j \to +\infty. \tag{4.9}$$

Let us prove (4.8). In view of the definition of the sequence $\{C_n'\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a partition of the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n_k\}$ into d pairwise disjoint sets $P_{n_k}^1, P_{n_k}^2, \ldots, P_{n_k}^d$ consisting, respectively, of $p_{n_k}^1, p_{n_k}^2, \ldots, p_{n_k}^d$ elements, where $0 \leqslant p_{n_k}^i \leqslant n_k$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ and $p_{n_k}^1 + \cdots + p_{n_k}^d = n_k$, such that

$$C_i' = C_1 \text{ for } i \in P_{n_k}^1,\ C_i' = C_2 \text{ for } i \in P_{n_k}^2,\ \ldots\ , C_i' = C_d \text{ for } i \in P_{n_k}^d.$$

Observe that $p_{n_k}^i = 0$ whenever $P_{n_k}^i = \varnothing$.

To fix ideas, suppose that $p_{n_k}^i \geqslant 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ (if some $p_{n_k}^i = 0$, the argument is similar). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_1' + \cdots + C_{n_k}'}{n_k} &= \frac{1}{n_k}\left[\overbrace{C_1 + \cdots + C_1}^{p_{n_k}^1-\text{times}} + \overbrace{C_2 + \cdots + C_2}^{p_{n_k}^2-\text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{C_d + \cdots + C_d}^{p_{n_k}^d-\text{times}}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n_k}\left[p_{n_k}^1 \frac{\overbrace{C_1 + \cdots + C_1}^{p_{n_k}^1-\text{times}}}{p_{n_k}^1} + p_{n_k}^2 \frac{\overbrace{C_2 + \cdots + C_2}^{p_{n_k}^2-\text{times}}}{p_{n_k}^2} + \cdots + p_{n_k}^d \frac{\overbrace{C_d + \cdots + C_d}^{p_{n_k}^d-\text{times}}}{p_{n_k}^d}\right] \\
&= \frac{p_{n_k}^1}{n_k} C_1[p_{n_k}^1] + \frac{p_{n_k}^2}{n_k} C_2[p_{n_k}^2] + \cdots + \frac{p_{n_k}^d}{n_k} C_d[p_{n_k}^d].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

For each fixed $i = 1, \ldots, d$ the sequence $\{p_{n_k}^i\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ is non-decreasing, *i.e.*, $p_{n_k}^i \leqslant p_{n_{k+1}}^i$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the sequence

$$\left\{\left(\frac{p_{n_k}^1}{n_k}, \frac{p_{n_k}^2}{n_k}, \ldots, \frac{p_{n_k}^d}{n_k}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}. \tag{4.11}$$

Evidently, $(p_{n_k}^1/n_k\,,\ p_{n_k}^2/n_k\,, \ldots,\ p_{n_k}^d/n_k) \in \Delta$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\Delta = \{(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d) | \lambda_i \geqslant 0,\ i = 0, \ldots, d \text{ and } \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_d = 1\},$$

and thus the sequence (4.11) contains a subsequence

$$\left\{\left(\frac{p_{n_{k_j}}^1}{n_{k_j}}, \frac{p_{n_{k_j}}^2}{n_{k_j}}, \ldots, \frac{p_{n_{k_j}}^d}{n_{k_j}}\right)\right\}_{j=1}^{+\infty}.$$

which converges to a limit $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d) \in \Delta$ as $j \to +\infty$. For each fixed $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$, if $p_{n_{k_j}}^i \to +\infty$ as $j \to +\infty$, then by Propositions 4.1 and 3.3,

$$\frac{p_{n_{k_j}}^i}{n_{k_j}} \overline{C_i[p_{n_{k_j}}^i]} \xrightarrow{F} \lambda_i \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_i \qquad \text{as } j \to +\infty. \tag{4.12}$$

It is evident that the latter limit remains valid also when $\{p^i_{n_{k_j}}\}_{j=1}^{+\infty}$ is bounded for, in this case, $\lambda_i = 0$. Set $\Gamma = \overline{\sum_{i=0}^{d} \lambda_i \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_i}$. From (4.10), by virtue of (4.12) and Proposition 3.3, it follows that

$$\frac{\overline{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}}}}{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{F} \Gamma \qquad \text{as } j \to +\infty$$

and thus (4.8) holds. Concerning (4.9), it suffices to observe that

$$\frac{\overline{\mathrm{co}} C'_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} C'_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{n_{k_j}} \left[\overbrace{\overline{\mathrm{co}} C_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_1}^{p^1_{n_{k_j}} - \text{times}} + \overbrace{\overline{\mathrm{co}} C_2 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_2}^{p^2_{n_{k_j}} - \text{times}} + \cdots + \overbrace{\overline{\mathrm{co}} C_d + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_d}^{p^d_{n_{k_j}} - \text{times}} \right]$$

$$= \frac{p^1_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}} \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_1 + \frac{p^2_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}} \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_2 + \cdots + \frac{p^d_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}} \overline{\mathrm{co}} C_d,$$

from which (4.9) follows at once, by letting $j \to +\infty$. Thus Claim 1 is valid.

Claim 2. We have $h(C, \Gamma) \leqslant \epsilon$.

Indeed, from (4.5) and (4.9) it follows that

$$\frac{\overline{\overline{\mathrm{co}} X_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} X_{n_{k_j}}}}{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } j \to +\infty \tag{4.13}$$

$$\frac{\overline{\overline{\mathrm{co}} C'_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} C'_{n_{k_j}}}}{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{F} \Gamma \qquad \text{as } j \to +\infty. \tag{4.14}$$

Furthermore, by construction, the sequence $\{C'_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ satisfies $h(X_n, C'_n) \leqslant \epsilon$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$h\left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}, \frac{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}} \right) \leqslant \frac{1}{n_{k_j}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{k_j}} h(X_i, C'_i) < \epsilon \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N} \tag{4.15}$$

and thus, a fortiori,

$$h\left(\frac{\overline{\overline{\mathrm{co}} X_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} X_{n_{k_j}}}}{n_{k_j}}, \frac{\overline{\overline{\mathrm{co}} C'_1 + \cdots + \overline{\mathrm{co}} C'_{n_{k_j}}}}{n_{k_j}} \right) < \epsilon \quad \text{for every } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then by virtue of Proposition 3.4, in view of (4.13)-(4.15), it follows that $h(C, \Gamma) \leqslant \epsilon$, and thus Claim 2 is proved.

With the help of Claims 1 and 2 we are now in a position to complete the proof of (jj). Since $z \in C$ and, by Claim 2, $h(C, \Gamma) \leqslant \epsilon$, there exists $y \in \Gamma$ such that

$$\|z - y\| < 2\epsilon. \tag{4.16}$$

As $y \in \Gamma$, then by (4.8) there is a $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$d\left(y, \frac{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}\right) < \epsilon \qquad \text{for every } j \geqslant j_0. \tag{4.17}$$

Taking into account (4.16), (4.17) and (4.15), for every $j \geqslant j_0$ we have

$$d\left(z, \frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}\right) \leqslant \|z - y\| +$$
$$+ d\left(y, \frac{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}\right) + h\left(\frac{C'_1 + \cdots + C'_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}, \frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_{n_{k_j}}}{n_{k_j}}\right) < 4\epsilon,$$

a contradiction to (4.6), since $\epsilon < \theta/8$. Hence also (jj) is valid and the proof of the theorem is complete. □

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ be a nonempty compact set in the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{Z}$, and let $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ be a compact and convex set. Then*

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{\text{co}}X_1 + \cdots + \overline{\text{co}}X_n}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty \tag{4.18}$$

implies

$$\overline{\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n}} \xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty.$$

Proof. Let us associate to the compact set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ the following subsets $\mathcal{U}$ and $\text{co}\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ defined as follows,

$$\mathcal{U} = \{Y \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid Y = \overline{\text{co}}X \text{ for some } X \in \mathcal{Z}\}$$

$$\text{co}\mathcal{U} = \{Y \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid Y = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i Y_i}, \text{ where } Y_i \in \mathcal{U}, \lambda_i \in [0,1], \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i = 1, d \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

Since $\mathcal{Z}$ is compact and, for arbitrary $A_1, A_2 \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, $h(\overline{\text{co}}A_1, \overline{\text{co}}A_2) \leqslant h(A_1, A_2)$, it follows that $\mathcal{U}$ is compact. Hence, by Proposition 3.6, the set $\mathcal{Z}_0 = \text{cl}[\text{co}\mathcal{U}]$ (the closure is taken in the h-metric) is a convex and compact set in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$.

Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ be a sequence satisfying (4.18) with $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ compact and convex. Hence, by Theorem 4.1,

$$\overline{\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n}} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty. \tag{4.19}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. From (4.19), for each $u \in C$ there exists $n_u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\overline{\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n}} \cap B(u, \epsilon) \neq \varnothing \qquad \text{for every } n \geqslant n_u. \tag{4.20}$$

As $\{B(u, \epsilon)\}_{u \in C}$ is an open covering of C it admits a finite subcovering, *i.e.*, there exist $u_1, \ldots, u_d \in C$ such that

$$C \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{d} B\left(u_i, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right). \tag{4.21}$$

Set $n' = \max\{n_{u_1}, \ldots, n_{u_d}\}$. Let $n \geqslant n'$ be arbitrary. By (4.20) (with u_i in the place of u) it follows that each ball $B(u_i, \epsilon/2)$, $i = 1, \ldots, d$, contains some points of $(\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n})/n$ and thus, by (4.21),

$$C \subset \frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n} + \epsilon B \qquad \text{for every } n \geqslant n'. \tag{4.22}$$

On the other hand for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\overline{\text{co}} \frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n} = \frac{\overline{\overline{\text{co}} X_1 + \cdots + \overline{\text{co}} X_n}}{n} \tag{4.23}$$

and thus, as each $\overline{\text{co}} X_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, is in the convex set $\mathcal{Z}_0$, it follows that $\overline{\text{co}}(\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n})/n \in \mathcal{Z}_0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}_0$ and C are compact and

$$\overline{\text{co}} \frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n} \xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty,$$

by virtue of (4.23) and (4.18). Hence by Proposition 3.5,

$$\overline{\text{co}} \frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n} \xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty.$$

Consequently, there exists $n'' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n} \subset \overline{\text{co}} \frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n} \subset C + \epsilon B \qquad \text{for every } n \geqslant n''. \tag{4.24}$$

Combining (4.22) and (4.24) yields

$$h\left(\frac{\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}}{n}, C\right) < \epsilon \qquad \text{for every } n \geqslant n_0,$$

where $n_0 = \max\{n', n''\}$. Hence $(\overline{X_1 + \cdots + X_n})/n \xrightarrow{h} C$ as $n \to +\infty$, completing the proof. □

5 Expectations of random sets in non separable Banach spaces

In this section we define a notion of expectation $E(F)$ for random sets $F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ where the underlying Banach space $\mathbb{E}$ is not necessarily separable. A few properties are reviewed and some proofs will be given since, in our non separable setting, the Kuratowski-Ryll Nardzewski theorem is not valid. For convex valued random sets $F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ the expectation is proven to be consistent with that obtained by using the classic Rådström embedding.

In what follows $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, P)$ is a complete probability space without atoms. Following Hille and Phillips [11, pp. 71-73], a map $G : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is said to be *countably-valued* if it admits a *representation* of the form

$$G(\omega) = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} A_i \chi_{\Omega_i}(\omega) \qquad \omega \in \Omega$$

where $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ and $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ is a measurable partition of Ω, *i.e.*, $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ is a partition of Ω consisting of sets $\Omega_i \in \mathscr{A}$.

Remark 5.1. It is worth noting that a countably valued map can have several representations.

A map $F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is said to be *strongly measurable* if there exists a sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ of countably-valued maps $G_n : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ which converge to F uniformly almost surely (a.s.) on Ω, *i.e.*,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} h_\infty(G_n, F) = 0 \qquad \text{where} \quad h_\infty(G_n, F) = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\omega\in\Omega} h(G_n(\omega), F(\omega)).$$

It is evident that a countably-valued map is strongly measurable.

A single-valued map $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ is said to be *measurable* if there exists a sequence of countably-valued maps $g_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ which converges uniformly a.s. on Ω to f, *i.e.*,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \|g_n - f\|_\infty = 0 \qquad \text{where} \quad \|g_n - f\|_\infty = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\omega\in\Omega} \|g_n(\omega) - f(\omega)\|.$$

A map $F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is said to be *weakly measurable* if for every $x \in \mathbb{E}$ the map $\omega \to d(x, F(\omega))$ is measurable.

The definition of a *simple* map $G : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is as in the single-valued case.

Remark 5.2. Let $F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ be a strongly measurable map. Then, we have: (a_1) F is weakly measurable; (a_2) $\|F\|$ is measurable, where $\|F\| : \Omega \to [0, +\infty)$ is defined by $\|F\|(\omega) = \|F(\omega)\|$, $\omega \in \Omega$; (a_3) $\overline{\text{co}}F$ is strongly measurable, where $\overline{\text{co}}F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is defined by $(\overline{\text{co}}F)(\omega) = \overline{\text{co}}F(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Moreover, $F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ is strongly measurable if and only if there exists a sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ of simple maps $G_n : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ converging to F a.s. on Ω.

The meaning of $L^p(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$, $1 \leqslant p \leqslant +\infty$, with the usual $\|\cdot\|_p$-norm is the standard one. In particular,

$$L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{E}) = \{f : \Omega \to \mathbb{E} \mid f \text{ is measurable and } \int_\Omega \|f\| dP < +\infty\}$$

and thus each $f \in L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ is integrable. Here and in what follows integrability and measurability for a function f are understood in the sense of Bochner.

Now set

$$\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})) = \left\{F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}) \mid F \text{ is s-measurable and } \int_\Omega \|F\| dP < +\infty\right\}$$

$$\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})) = \left\{F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid F \text{ is s-measurable and } \int_\Omega \|F\| dP < +\infty\right\}$$

and, furthermore, let

$$\mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})) = \left\{F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}) \mid F \text{ is count-valued and } \int_\Omega \|F\| dP < +\infty\right\}$$

$$\mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})) = \left\{F : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid F \text{ is count-valued and } \int_\Omega \|F\| dP < +\infty\right\}.$$

In the above definitions s-measurable and count-valued stand for strongly measurable and countable-valued respectively. In what follows an element $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$

will also be called a *random* set.
For any $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ we define

$$\mathrm{S}^1_F = \{f : \Omega \to \mathbb{E} \mid f \text{ is a measurable selector of } F\}$$
$$\mathrm{V}^1_F = \{f : \Omega \to \mathbb{E} \mid f \text{ is a countably-valued selector of } F\}\,.$$

Here by a *measurable* (resp. *countably-valued*) selection of F we mean a measurable (resp. countably-valued) map $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ satisfying $f(\omega) \in F(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Clearly S^1_F and V^1_F are (perhaps empty) subsets of $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$. The meaning of $\mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{W})$ and $\mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{W})$, where $\mathcal{W}$ is a nonempty subset of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{E})$, is evident.

Remark 5.3. (a_1) For each $G \in \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ the set V^1_G is nonempty; (a_2) Let $G \in \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ and $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ be bounded countably-valued maps satisfying, for some $\alpha > 0$, $d(g(\omega), G(\omega)) < \alpha$ a.s. on Ω. Then there exists a bounded countably-valued map $\tilde{g} \in \mathrm{V}^1_G$ such that $\|\tilde{g} - g\|_\infty \leqslant \alpha$.

The following measurable selection theorem is a variant of the Kuratowski-Ryll Nardzewski theorem [15, 14].

Theorem 5.1. *For each $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ the set S^1_F is nonempty.*

Proof. Let $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$. Suppose first that F is bounded. Let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ be a sequence of countably-valued maps $G_n : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, given by

$$G_n(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i^n \chi_{\Omega_i^n}(\omega) \qquad \omega \in \Omega \tag{5.1}$$

where, for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{A_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ and $\{\Omega_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ is a measurable partition of Ω, such that G_n converges to F uniformly a.s. on Ω. Without loss of generality, passing to a subsequence if necessary, with the same notation as before, we can assume that

$$h_\infty(G_n, F) < \frac{\epsilon_n}{2} \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\epsilon_n = 1/2^n$. Hence,

$$h_\infty(G_n, G_{n+1}) < \epsilon_n \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Fix $g_1 \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_1}$. Since $d(g_1(\omega), G_2(\omega)) \leqslant h(G_1(\omega), G_2(\omega)) \leqslant h_\infty(G_1, G_2) < \epsilon_1$ a.s. on Ω, in view of Remark 5.3, (a_1), there exists $g_2 \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_1}$ such that

$$\|g_2 - g_1\|_\infty \leqslant \epsilon_1.$$

Clearly $g_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$, for g_2 is bounded. Similarly, we have $d(g_2(\omega), G_3(\omega)) \leqslant h(G_2(\omega), G_3(\omega)) \leqslant h_\infty(G_2, G_3) < \epsilon_2$ a.s. on Ω, and thus there exists $g_3 \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_3}$ satisfying

$$\|g_3 - g_2\|_\infty \leqslant \epsilon_2,$$

and evidently $g_3 \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$. By this procedure one can construct a sequence $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ with $g_n \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_n}$ such that

$$\|g_{n+1} - g_n\|_\infty \leqslant \epsilon_n \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ and thus it converges to some $\phi \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$. Since

$$d(\phi(\omega), F(\omega)) \leqslant \|\phi(\omega) - g_n(\omega)\| + d(g_n(\omega), G_n(\omega)) + h(G_n(\omega), F(\omega)) \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega$$

and, for $n \to +\infty$, $\|\phi(\omega) - g_n(\omega)\|_\infty \to 0$ and $h_\infty(G_n(\omega), F(\omega)) \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$, it follows that ϕ is a measurable selection of F and thus $\phi \in \mathrm{S}_F^1$.

Now suppose that F is not bounded. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\Omega_k = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid k - 1 \leqslant \|F(\omega)\| < k\}$ and observe that $\{\Omega_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ is a measurable partition of Ω. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define $F_k : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ by $F_k(\omega) = F(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega_k$. As F_k is strongly measurable and bounded on Ω_k it admits a measurable selection, say $f_k : \Omega_k \to \mathbb{E}$. Then the map $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ given by

$$f(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} f_k(\omega)\chi_{\Omega_k}(\omega) \qquad \omega \in \Omega,$$

is a measurable selection of F. Therefore $\mathrm{S}_F^1 \neq \varnothing$, completing the proof. □

Proposition 5.1. *Let $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ and $r > 0$. Then, for each $\sigma > 0$,*

$$S^1_{\overline{F+rB}} \subset S^1_F + (r + \sigma)S^1_B. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.1 the sets $\mathrm{S}^1_{\overline{F+rB}}$ and S^1_F are nonempty and, clearly, $\mathrm{S}^1_B \neq \varnothing$.

Claim. Let $\sigma > 0$. For every $\phi \in \mathrm{S}^1_{\overline{F+rB}}$ there exist $f \in \mathrm{S}^1_F$ and $\gamma \in \mathrm{S}^1_B$ such that

$$\phi(\omega) = f(\omega) + (r + \sigma)\gamma(\omega) \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega. \tag{5.3}$$

Indeed, suppose that F and ϕ are bounded, and let $\phi \in \mathrm{S}^1_{\overline{F+rB}}$ be arbitrary. Thus

$$\phi(\omega) \in \overline{F(\omega) + rB} \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega. \tag{5.4}$$

Let $\phi_0 : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ be a countably-valued map satisfying

$$\|\phi_0 - \phi\|_\infty < \frac{\sigma}{8}, \tag{5.5}$$

and let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ be a sequence of countably-valued maps $G_n : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, given by (5.1), converging to F uniformly a.s. on Ω. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that

$$h_\infty(G_n, F) < \frac{\epsilon_n}{2} \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{5.6}$$

where $\epsilon_n = \sigma/2^{n+2}$. Hence

$$h_\infty(G_n, G_{n+1}) < \epsilon_n \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.7}$$

By virtue of (5.5), (5.4) and (5.6) (with $n = 1$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_0(\omega) &\in \phi(\omega) + \frac{\sigma}{8}B \subset \overline{F(\omega) + rB} + \frac{\sigma}{4}B \subset (F(\omega) + rB + \epsilon B) + \frac{\sigma}{4}B \\ &\subset G_1(\omega) + \left(r + \frac{\sigma}{4} + \epsilon_1\right)B \subset G_1(\omega) + \left(r + \frac{\sigma}{2}\right)B \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega,\end{aligned}$$

and thus $d(\phi_0(\omega), G_1(\omega)) < r + \sigma/2$ a.s. on Ω. Then by virtue of Remark 5.3 (a_2), there exists a $g_1 \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_1}$ such that

$$\|g_1 - \phi_0\|_\infty \leqslant r + \frac{\sigma}{2}B. \tag{5.8}$$

Now, by (5.7) we have $d(g_1(\omega), G_2(\omega)) \leqslant h(G_1(\omega), G_2(\omega)) \leqslant h_\infty(G_1, G_2) < \epsilon_1$ a.s. on Ω, and thus there exists $g_2 \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_2}$ such that $\|g_2 - g_1\|_\infty \leqslant \epsilon_1$. By this procedure one can construct a sequence $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$, with $g_n \in \mathrm{V}^1_{G_n}$, satisfying

$$\|g_{n+1} - g_n\|_\infty \leqslant \epsilon_n \qquad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.9}$$

Evidently, (5.9) implies that $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ and thus, for some $f \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$, $\|g_n - f\|_\infty \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$. Moreover, by (5.6) we have $h_\infty(G_n, F) \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$. Since $g_n(\omega) \in G_n(\omega)$ a.s. on Ω, it follows that $f(\omega) \in F(\omega)$ a.s. on Ω, that is f is a measurable selection of F, and hence $f \in \mathrm{S}^1_F$.

On the other hand in view of (5.8) and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned}\|g_{n+1}(\omega) - \phi_0(\omega)\| &\leqslant \|g_1(\omega) - \phi_0(\omega)\| + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \|g_{k+1}(\omega) - g_k(\omega)\| \\ &\leqslant r + \frac{\sigma}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \epsilon_k < r + \frac{3}{4}\sigma \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega,\end{aligned}$$

from which letting $n \to +\infty$ one has $\|f - \phi_0\|_\infty \leqslant r + 3\sigma/4$. The latter and (5.5) imply

$$\|\phi - f\|_\infty < r + \sigma. \tag{5.10}$$

Now define $\gamma : \Omega \to \mathbb{E}$ by $\gamma(\omega) = (\phi(\omega) - f(\omega))/(r + \sigma)$ for $\omega \in \Omega$ a.s. Since $\gamma \in \mathrm{S}^1_B$, by (5.10), $f \in \mathrm{S}^1_F$ and, moreover,

$$\phi(\omega) = f(\omega) + (\phi(\omega) - f(\omega)) = f(\omega) + (r + \sigma)\gamma(\omega) \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega,$$

it follows that (5.3) is valid, whenever F and ϕ are bounded. The general case, when F and ϕ are not necessarily bounded, can be treated as in Theorem 5.1 and thus the proof is omitted. Hence the Claim is proved. The statement (5.2) is an immediate consequence of the Claim. This completes the proof. □

Let us recall that the sum of a series $\overline{\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} C_i}$, where $C_i \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$, is a set $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ (if it exists) such that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} h(\overline{\sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i}, C) = 0$. Moreover, the sum C exists and is unique if the series is absolutely convergent, *i.e.*, if $\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \|C_i\| < +\infty$.

Definition 5.1. Let $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$. The *Aumann integral* of F on Ω (see [3, 12]) is defined by

$$(\mathrm{A})\int_\Omega F dP = \overline{\left\{ \int_\Omega f dP \mid f \in \mathrm{S}^1_F \right\}}.$$

Remark 5.4. The above definition is meaningful since $\mathrm{S}^1_F \neq \varnothing$, by Theorem 5.1. Moreover, the Aumann integral of F is a set $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ which, obviously, exists and is unique.

Let $G \in \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ be a countably-valued map $G : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ with representation given by

$$G(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i \chi_{\Omega_i}(\omega) \qquad \omega \in \Omega,$$

where $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$, and $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ is a measurable partition of Ω. The *Hukuhara integral* of G on Ω is defined by

$$(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega} G dP = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i P(\Omega_i).$$

Remark 5.5. Since the above series is absolutely convergent, it converges to a set $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$, which exists and is unique. Moreover this set C is independent of the representation of G and thus the Hukuhara integral of $G \in \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ is meaningful.

Definition 5.2. Let $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ and let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ be a sequence of countably-valued maps converging to F uniformly a.s. on Ω. The *Hukuhara integral* of F on Ω [13] is defined by

$$(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega} F dP = \lim_{n \to +\infty} (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega} G_n dP.$$

Remark 5.6. As in [11, p.79], it can be shown that the above limit exists and is unique, actually it is a set $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. Moreover this set C is independent of the particular sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ used in the definition. Therefore the Hukuhara integral of $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ is meaningful.

It is worth noting that the Aumann and Hukuhara integrals are well defined also when Ω is replaced by a set $\Omega' \in \mathscr{A}$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\Omega' \in \mathscr{A}$. Then for each $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$,*

$$(A)\int_{\Omega'} C dP = (H)\int_{\Omega'} C dP. \tag{5.11}$$

Moreover for each $C \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$,

$$(A)\int_{\Omega'} C dP = (H)\int_{\Omega'} (\overline{co} C) dP. \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. Indeed for each $\sigma \in \mathrm{S}^1_C$,

$$\int_{\Omega'} \sigma dP \in C P(\Omega') = (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} C dP,$$

which implies that the set on the left hand side of (5.11) is contained in the set on the right hand side. Moreover,

$$(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} C dP = C P(\Omega') = \left\{ \int_{\Omega'} c dP \mid c \in C \right\} \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} C dP,$$

and thus (5.11) holds.

Now consider (5.12). Clearly by virtue of (5.11)

$$(\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} C dP \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} (\overline{\mathrm{co}}C) dP = (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} (\overline{\mathrm{co}}C) dP.$$

To prove the reverse inclusion, let $\epsilon > 0$ and consider an arbitrary point $\bar{\xi} \in (\overline{\mathrm{co}}C)P(\Omega')$. Take a $\xi \in (\mathrm{co}C)P(\Omega')$ such that $\|\xi - \bar{\xi}\| < \epsilon$. Clearly, for some $c_i \in C$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, with $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n = 1$, we have $\xi = P(\Omega')(\lambda_1 c_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n c_n)$. Now $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, P)$ is a complete probability space without atoms, and thus by Liapunoff convexity theorem [7] there exists a measurable partition of Ω', say $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n$, such that $P(\Omega_i) = \lambda_i P(\Omega')$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Define $\sigma : \Omega' \to \mathbb{E}$ by $\sigma(\omega) = c_1 \chi_{\Omega_1}(\omega) + \cdots + c_n \chi_{\Omega_n}(\omega)$, for $\omega \in \Omega'$. Clearly $\sigma \in \mathrm{S}^1_C$. Moreover

$$\xi = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i c_i P(\Omega') = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i P(\Omega_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\Omega'} c_i \chi_{\Omega_i} dP = \int_{\Omega'} \sigma dP \in (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} C dP,$$

and hence, as $\bar{\xi} \in \xi + \epsilon B$,

$$\bar{\xi} \in (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} C dP + \epsilon B.$$

Since $\bar{\xi} \in (\overline{\mathrm{co}}C)P(\Omega')$ and $\epsilon > 0$ are arbitrary, it follows that

$$(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} (\overline{\mathrm{co}}C) dP \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} C dP,$$

and thus (5.12) is valid. This completes the proof. □

By virtue of Proposition 5.2 we have

Proposition 5.3. *Let* $G_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$, $G_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ *and let* $\Omega' \in \mathscr{A}$. *Then,*

$$(A)\int_{\Omega'} G_1 dP = (H)\int_{\Omega'} G_1 dP \qquad (A)\int_{\Omega'} G_2 dP = (H)\int_{\Omega'} (\overline{co}G_2) dP.$$

Proposition 5.4. *Let* $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ *and let* $\Omega' \in \mathscr{A}$. *Then,*

$$(A)\int_{\Omega'} F dP = (H)\int_{\Omega'} F dP. \tag{5.13}$$

Proof. Suppose first that $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ is bounded. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $\bar{\xi}$ be an arbitrary point in the Aumann integral of F. Then for some $f \in \mathrm{S}^1_F$, setting $\xi = \int_{\Omega'} f dP$, we have

$$\|\bar{\xi} - \xi\| < \epsilon. \tag{5.14}$$

Let $\{\phi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ and $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ be sequences of countably-valued maps converging, respectively, to f and F, uniformly a.s. on Ω. Without loss of generality we can assume that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, ϕ_n and G_n have representations given by

$$\phi_n(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} a_i^n \chi_{\Omega_i^n}(\omega) \qquad G_n(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i^n \chi_{\Omega_i^n}(\omega), \qquad \omega \in \Omega',$$

where $\{a_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{E}$, $\{A_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$, $\{\Omega_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ is a measurable partition of Ω' and, moreover,

$$\|\phi_n - f\|_\infty < \frac{1}{n} \qquad h_\infty(G_n, F) < \frac{1}{n}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.15}$$

Now, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\phi_n(\omega) \in f(\omega) + \|\phi_n - f\|_\infty B \subset F(\omega) + \frac{1}{n}B \subset G_n(\omega) + \frac{2}{n}B \qquad \text{a.s. on } \Omega'$$

and thus, denoting by $\tilde{G}_n : \Omega' \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ a map with representation given by

$$\tilde{G}_n(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \tilde{A}_i^n \chi_{\Omega_i^n}(\omega), \qquad \omega \in \Omega'$$

where $\tilde{A}_i^n = \overline{A_i^n + B/n}$, it follows that $\phi_n(\omega) \in \tilde{G}_n(\omega)$ a.s. on Ω'. Consequently

$$\int_{\Omega'} \phi_n dP \in (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} \tilde{G}_n dP. \tag{5.16}$$

Evidently $\{\tilde{G}_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega', \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ is a sequence of countably-valued maps $\tilde{G}_n : \Omega' \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ converging to F uniformly a.s. on Ω'. Then letting $n \to +\infty$, from (5.16) in view of Remark 5.6 one has

$$\xi = \int_{\Omega'} f dP \in (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} F dP.$$

Since $\tilde{\xi}$ is an arbitrary point in the Aumann integral of F, from the latter and (5.14) it follows that

$$(\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} F dP \subset (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} F dP + \epsilon B. \tag{5.17}$$

Let us prove the reverse inclusion, obtained by interchanging the roles of the Aumann and Hukuhara integrals. To this end, fix $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $n_0 > 4/\epsilon$. Then for every $n \geqslant n_0$ by virtue of Proposition 5.3 and (5.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} G_n\, dP &= (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} G_n dP \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} \left(\overline{F + \frac{1}{n}B}\right) dP \\ &\subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} \left(\overline{F + \frac{\epsilon}{4}B}\right) dP \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} F\, dP + \frac{3\epsilon}{4}B,\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

where the last inclusion holds because, by Proposition 5.1 (with r, σ and Ω replaced by $\epsilon/r, \epsilon/4$ and Ω' respectively),

$$\mathrm{S}^1_{\overline{F + \frac{\epsilon}{4}B}} \subset \mathrm{S}^1_F + \frac{3\epsilon}{4}\mathrm{S}^1_B.$$

From (5.18) letting $n \to +\infty$ one has

$$(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} F\, dP \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} F\, dP + \epsilon B.$$

Since the Aumann and the Hukuhara integrals are closed sets and $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, from the latter and (5.17) it follows that (5.13) is valid. Thus the statement is proved, whenever $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ is bounded.

Suppose that $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}))$ is not bounded. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\Omega_n = \{\omega \in \Omega' \mid \|F(\omega)\| > n\}$ and define

$$F_n(\omega) = \begin{cases} F(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in \Omega' \backslash \Omega_n, \\ n & \text{if } \omega \in \Omega_n. \end{cases}$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$ fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\int_{\Omega_n} \|F\| dP < \epsilon \tag{5.19}$$

By virtue of (5.19) the Aumann and the Hukuhara integrals of F_n on Ω_n are contained in the ball ϵB, hence

$$h\left((\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega'} FdP,\ (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega' \backslash \Omega_n} F_n dP \right) < \epsilon$$
$$h\left((\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega'} FdP,\ (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega' \backslash \Omega_n} F_n dP \right) < \epsilon.$$

Since F_n is bounded on $\Omega' \backslash \Omega_n$, the Aumann and the Hukuhara integrals of F_n on $\Omega' \backslash \Omega_n$ are equal. Consequently as $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, (5.13) is valid also when F is not bounded. This completes the proof. ☐

Proposition 5.5. *For each* $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$

$$(A)\int_{\Omega} FdP = (H)\int_{\Omega} (\overline{\mathrm{co}}F)dP. \tag{5.20}$$

Proof. By virtue of Proposition 5.4,

$$(\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega} FdP \subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega} (\overline{\mathrm{co}}F)dP = (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega} (\overline{\mathrm{co}}F)dP. \tag{5.21}$$

To prove the reverse inclusion, let $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ be a sequence of countably-valued maps $G_n : \Omega \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ converging to F uniformly a.s. on Ω. Suppose that each G_n has a representation given by

$$G_n(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i^n \chi_{\Omega_i^n}(\omega), \qquad \omega \in \Omega,$$

where $\{A_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, $\{\Omega_i^n\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ is a measurable partition of Ω. Given $\epsilon > 0$ take $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$h_\infty(G_n, F) < \epsilon, \qquad h_\infty(\overline{\mathrm{co}}G_n, \overline{\mathrm{co}}F) < \epsilon \qquad \text{for all } n \geqslant n_0, \tag{5.22}$$

the second inequality being a consequence of the first one. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega}(\overline{\mathrm{co}}F)dP &\subset (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega}\overline{(\overline{\mathrm{co}}G_n+\epsilon B)}dP \qquad \text{by (5.22)}\\
&\subset (\mathrm{H})\int_{\Omega}\overline{\mathrm{co}}G_n dP + 2\epsilon B \qquad\qquad (5.23)\\
&= (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega}G_n dP + 2\epsilon B \qquad \text{by Proposition 5.3}\\
&\subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega}(\overline{F+\epsilon B})dP + 2\epsilon B \qquad \text{by (5.22)}\\
&\subset (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega}F\,dP + 4\epsilon B,
\end{aligned}$$

where the latter inclusion holds by Proposition 5.1 (with $r = \epsilon$ and $\sigma = \epsilon/2$). Combining (5.21) and (5.23), as $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, one obtains (5.20). This completes the proof. ☐

Definition 5.3. The *expectation* $E(F)$ of a random set $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ is defined by

$$E(F) = (\mathrm{A})\int_{\Omega}FdP.$$

As an immediate consequence of the above definition and Proposition 5.5 we have the following:

Proposition 5.6. *For each random set* $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$

$$E(F) = (H)\int_{\Omega}(\overline{co}F)dP.$$

6 Strong laws of large numbers

In this section we present two versions of the strong law of large numbers for random sets with values in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ or in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, where $\mathbb{E}$ is an arbitrary not necessarily separable Banach space. Since in our approach we use a Rådström embedding technique we start by reviewing some of its properties (see [21, 3]).

In what follows the space $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is equipped with the operations of *addition* $X \dot{+} Y$ and *multiplication* λX by non negative scalars defined, for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ and $\lambda \geqslant 0$ as follows

$$X \dot{+} Y = \overline{\{x + y \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}}, \qquad \lambda X = \{\lambda x \mid x \in X\}.$$

Clearly $X \dot{+} Y$ and λX are in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$.

The following Propositions 6.1-6.3 can be proved as in [10, 21].

Proposition 6.1. *For arbitrary* $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ *and* $\lambda, \mu \geqslant 0$ *we have:* (a_1) $X \dot{+} \{0\} = X$; (a_2) $X \dot{+} Y = Y \dot{+} X$; (a_3) $X \dot{+} (Y \dot{+} Z) = (X \dot{+} Y) \dot{+} Z$; (a_4) $1 \cdot X = X$; (a_5) $\lambda(\mu X) = (\lambda\mu)X$; (a_6) $\lambda(X \dot{+} Y) = \lambda X \dot{+} \lambda Y$; (a_7) $(\lambda + \mu)X = \lambda X \dot{+} \mu Y$. *Moreover the operations of addition and multiplication by non negative scalars are continuous in the topology generated by the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric* h *of* $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let A, C, Z be non empty subsets of $\mathbb{E}$ and suppose that C is convex and Z is bounded. Then*

$$\overline{A+Z} \subset \overline{C+Z} \quad \Rightarrow \quad A \subset \overline{C}.$$

Proposition 6.3. (*i*) *For $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$*

$$X \dot{+} Z = Y \dot{+} Z \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad X = Y.$$

(*ii*) *For $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ and $\lambda \geqslant 0$*

$$h(X \dot{+} Z, Y \dot{+} Z) = h(X, Y) \qquad h(\lambda X, \lambda Y) = \lambda h(X, Y).$$

By virtue of Propositions 6.1-6.3, adapting some arguments from [3, 10, 20, 21] one can establish the following

Proposition 6.4 (Rådström embedding)**.** *There exists a Banach space $(\mathbb{F}, \|\cdot\|)$ and a map $J : \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \to \mathbb{V}$, where $\mathbb{V} = J(\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})) \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that:*

(*i*) *$J(\lambda X \dot{+} \mu Y) = \lambda J(X) + \mu J(Y)$ for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ and $\lambda, \mu \geqslant 0$;*

(*ii*) *$\|J(X) - J(Y)\| = h(X, Y)$ for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$;*

(*iii*) *$\mathbb{V}$ is a convex cone in $\mathbb{F}$, complete under the metric induced by the norm of $\mathbb{F}$.*

It is worth noting that, since $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is a complete metric space under the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h, then any nonempty closed subset of $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is a complete metric space under the induced metric.

A nonempty set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is called a *semilinear complete metric space* if: (a_1) $\mathcal{W}$ is closed in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$; (a_2) $\mathcal{W}$ is stable under the operations of addition and multiplication by nonnegative scalars, *i.e.*, for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\lambda \geqslant 0$ we have $X \dot{+} Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\lambda X \in \mathcal{W}$.

It is evident that the space $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ itself is a semilinear complete metric space.

Retaining the above notations we now prove a useful variant of Proposition 6.4.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ be a semilinear complete and separable metric space. Let $\tilde{J}$ be the restriction of J to $\mathcal{W}$. Then there exists a separable Banach space $(\tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \|\cdot\|)$ such that the map $\tilde{J} : \mathcal{W} \to \mathbb{W}$, where $\mathbb{W} = \tilde{J}(\mathcal{W}) \subset \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ has the following properties:*

(*i*) *$\tilde{J}(\lambda X \dot{+} \mu Y) = \lambda \tilde{J}(X) + \mu \tilde{J}(Y)$ for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\lambda, \mu \geqslant 0$;*

(*ii*) *$\|\tilde{J}(X) - \tilde{J}(Y)\| = h(X, Y)$ for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{W}$;*

(*iii*) *$\mathbb{W}$ is a convex cone in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, complete under the metric induced by the norm of $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$.*

Proof. Set $\tilde{\mathbb{F}} = \overline{\operatorname{span} \mathbb{W}}$, where $\operatorname{span} \mathbb{W}$ denotes the linear span of $\mathbb{W}$, and observe that $\tilde{\mathbb{F}} \subset \mathbb{F}$, since $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{F}$ by Proposition 6.4. Moreover $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ is separable, because the separability of $\mathcal{W}$ implies that $\mathbb{W}$ as well as its linear span are separable. Therefore $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, as a closed and separable linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}$, is actually a separable Banach

space uneder the induced norm of $\mathbb{F}$. It remains to verify $(i)-(iii)$.
(i) Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\lambda, \mu \geqslant 0$. Since $\lambda X \dot{+} \mu Y \in \mathcal{W}$, then by Proposition 6.4 one has

$$\tilde{J}(\lambda X \dot{+} \mu Y) = J(\lambda X \dot{+} \lambda Y) = \lambda J(X) + \mu J(Y) = \lambda \tilde{J}(X) + \mu \tilde{J}(Y).$$

(ii) This is obvious, since for $X, Y \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\|\tilde{J}(X) - \tilde{J}(Y)\| = \|J(X) - J(Y)\| = h(X, Y).$$

(iii) The set $\mathbb{W} \subset \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ is a convex cone. In fact let $s, t \geqslant 0$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{W}$ be arbitrary. Then $\xi = J(X)$, $\eta = J(Y)$ for some $X, Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and thus

$$s\xi + t\eta = sJ(X) + tJ(Y) = J(sX \dot{+} tY) = \tilde{J}(sX \dot{+} tY),$$

since $sX \dot{+} tY \in \mathcal{W}$. Hence $s\xi + t\eta \in \mathcal{W}$, and so $\mathbb{W}$ is a convex cone. Moreover $\mathbb{W}$ is closed in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$. To see this, consider an arbitrary sequence $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{W}$ converging to some $\xi \in \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $X_n \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $\tilde{J}(X_n) = \xi_n$. By virtue of (ii) the sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{W}$ is Cauchy and thus, as $\mathcal{W}$ is complete, it converges to some $X \in \mathcal{W}$. Set $\tilde{\xi} = \tilde{J}(X)$. Since by (ii)

$$\|\xi_n - \tilde{\xi}\| = \|\tilde{J}(X_n) - \tilde{J}(X)\| = h(X_n, X),$$

it follows that $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ converges to $\tilde{\xi}$ as $n \to +\infty$. By the uniqueness of the limit one has $\xi = \tilde{\xi}$, *i.e.*, $\xi = \tilde{J}(X)$. Hence $\xi \in \mathbb{W}$ and thus $\mathbb{W}$ is closed in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$. This completes the proof. ☐

Proposition 6.6. *Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a semilinear complete and separable metric space and, retaining the notation of Proposition 6.5, let $\mathbb{W} = \tilde{J}(\mathcal{W})$. Let $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{W})$. Then the map $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{W}$ given by $\xi(\omega) = \tilde{J}(F(\omega))$, $\omega \in \Omega$, is Bochner integrable on Ω, i.e., $\xi \in L^1(\Omega, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$. Moreover,*

$$\tilde{J}\left((H)\!\int_{\Omega} F dP \right) = \int_{\Omega} \xi dP, \tag{6.1}$$

where the integral on the right-hand side is an element of $\mathbb{W}$.

Proof. As $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{W})$, there is a sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{W})$ of countably-valued maps $G_n : \Omega \to \mathcal{W}$ converging to F uniformly a.s. in Ω. Consider the corresponding sequence $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$, where $\xi_n : \Omega \to \tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ is given by $\xi_n(\omega) = \tilde{J}(G_n(\omega))$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Clearly $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$, since each ξ_n is countably-valued and, for some $k > 0$, $\|\xi_n(\omega)\| \leqslant \|F(\omega)\| + k$, a.s. on $\omega \in \Omega$. Moreover the sequence $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset L^1(\Omega, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$ converges to ξ uniformly a.s. in Ω, because by Proposition 6.5

$$\|\xi_n(\omega) - \xi(\omega)\| = \|\tilde{J}(G_n(\omega)) - \tilde{J}(F(\omega))\| = h(G_n(\omega), F(\omega)) \qquad \omega \in \Omega,$$

and hence ξ is measurable. Moreover $\|\xi(\omega)\| \leqslant \|F(\omega)\| + k$ a.s. on Ω and thus $\xi \in L^1(\Omega, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$. Furthermore, by Proposition 6.5, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$\tilde{J}\left(\text{(H)}\!\int_{\Omega} G_n dP \right) = \int_{\Omega} \xi_n dP,$$

from which (6.1) follows at once by letting $n \to +\infty$. Moreover the integral on the right-hand side of (6.1) is an element of $\mathcal{W}$, because each ξ_n takes values in $\mathbb{W}$, and $\mathbb{W}$ is a convex and closed cone contained in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$. This completes the proof. ☐

It is worth noting that, by Proposition 5.6, the expectation $E(F)$ of any random set $F \in \mathbb{L}^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}))$ is a nonempty bounded closed and convex subset of $\mathbb{E}$, *i.e.*, $E(F) = C$ where $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a nonempty separable subset of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, equipped with the induced Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ be a sequence of independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random sets $X_n : \Omega \to \mathcal{U}$ with expectation $E(X_n) = C$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $C \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. Then*

$$\frac{\overline{\overline{co}X_1(\omega) + \cdots + \overline{co}X_n(\omega)}}{n} \xrightarrow{h} C \qquad as\, n \to +\infty, \quad a.s.\ on\ \Omega.$$

Proof. Set $\mathcal{V} = \{Z \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid Z = \overline{\mathrm{co}}X \text{ where } X \in \mathcal{U}\}$ and define

$$\mathcal{W}_0 = \{Z \in \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E}) \mid Z = \lambda_1 X_1 \dot{+} \ldots \dot{+} \lambda_n X_n \\ \text{for some } X_i \in \mathcal{V}, \lambda_i \geqslant 0, i = 1, \ldots, n,\ n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathrm{cl}_{\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})}[\mathcal{W}_0].$$

The set $\mathcal{V}$ is separable. To see this let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{U}$ be a sequence dense in $\mathcal{U}$. Then the sequence $\{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty} \subset \mathcal{V}$ is dense in $\mathcal{V}$. In fact, given $\epsilon > 0$ and $Z \in \mathcal{V}$, *i.e.*, $Z = \overline{\mathrm{co}}X$ for some $X \in \mathcal{U}$, then taking a X_n so that $h(X_n, X) < \epsilon$ one has $h(\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n, \overline{\mathrm{co}}X) < \epsilon$. Clearly, the separability of $\mathcal{V}$ implies that both $\mathcal{W}_0$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are separable. As $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is complete, and $\mathcal{W}$ is closed in $\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ it follows that $\mathcal{W}$ equipped with the Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h is a complete metric space. In addition $\mathcal{W}$ is stable under the operations of addition and multiplication by nonnegative scalars because $\mathcal{W}_0$ is so. Hence, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is a semilinear complete and separable metric space. Then, by virtue of Proposition 6.5, there exists a separable Banach space $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ such that, denoting by $\tilde{J}$ the restriction of J to $\mathcal{W}$ and setting $\mathbb{W} = \tilde{J}(\mathcal{W})$, the properties of Proposition 6.5 are satisfied.

Now consider the sequence of random sets $\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n : \Omega \to \mathcal{W}$. In view of [22], $\{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random sets because $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is so and, moreover, the map $\overline{\mathrm{co}} : \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E}) \to \mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is nonexpansive. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\xi_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{W}$ be given by

$$\xi_n(\omega) = \tilde{J}(\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n(\omega)) \qquad \omega \in \Omega.$$

As the map $\tilde{J} : \mathcal{W} \to \mathbb{W}$ is nonexpansive, it follows that $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables and, moreover, each ξ_n takes values in $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$, a separable Banach space. Furthermore for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E(\xi_n) = \int_\Omega \xi_n dP = \int_\Omega \tilde{J}(\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n) dP = \tilde{J}\left((\mathrm{H})\int_\Omega (\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n) dP\right) = \tilde{J}(E(X_n)) = \tilde{J}(C),$$

since the Hukuhara integral equals $E(X_n)$ by Proposition 5.6, and $E(X_n) = C$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by hypothesis. By virtue of the SLLN theorem for random variables in a separable Banach spaces (see [18]) it follows that

$$\frac{\xi_1(\omega) + \cdots + \xi_n(\omega)}{n} \to \tilde{J}(C) \qquad \text{as } n \to +\infty, \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

Consequently, by virtue of Proposition 6.5,

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_1(\omega)+\cdots+\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \text{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a nonempty separable subset of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$ equipped with the induced Pompeiu-Hausdorff metric h of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random sets $X_n:\Omega\to\mathcal{U}$ with expectation $E(X_n)=C$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, where $C\in\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. Furthermore suppose that*

$$\{X_n(\omega)\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}\subset\mathcal{Z}(\omega) \qquad \textit{a.s. on } \Omega, \tag{6.2}$$

where, for $\omega\in\Omega$ a.s., $\mathcal{Z}(\omega)$ is a nonempty compact subset of $\mathcal{U}$. Then

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega)+\cdots+X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \textit{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \textit{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

If, in addition, $C\in\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is compact, then

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega)+\cdots+X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \textit{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \textit{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

Proof. By virtue of Theorem 6.1

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_1(\omega)+\cdots+\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \text{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

and thus, a fortiori,

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_1(\omega)+\cdots+\overline{\mathrm{co}}X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

From the latter and (6.2), by Theorem 4.1, it follows that

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega)+\cdots+X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \text{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega. \tag{6.3}$$

If $C\in\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$ is also compact, then from (6.3), in view of Theorem 4.2, one has

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega)+\cdots+X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \text{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \text{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 6.1. *Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{+\infty}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random sets $X_n:\Omega\to\mathcal{Z}$, where $\mathcal{Z}$ is a compact subset of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$, with expectations $E(X_n)=C$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$, where $C\in\mathfrak{C}_c(\mathbb{E})$. Then*

$$\overline{\frac{\overline{co}X_1(\omega)+\cdots+\overline{co}X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{h} C \qquad \textit{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \textit{a.s. on } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{\frac{X_1(\omega)+\cdots+X_n(\omega)}{n}}\xrightarrow{F} C \qquad \textit{as } n\to+\infty, \quad \textit{a.s. on } \Omega.$$

Proof. The statement follows from Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, since $\mathcal{Z}$ is a separable subset of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{E})$. $\square$

Remark 6.1. It is worth noting that in Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 the separability assumption on $\mathcal{U}$ and the compactness assumption on $\mathcal{Z}(\omega)$ do not imply that the corresponding sets $U \subset \mathbb{E}$ and $V \subset \mathbb{E}$ given by

$$U = \bigcup\{X \mid X \in \mathcal{U}\}, \qquad V = \overline{\bigcup\{X_n(\omega) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}}$$

be respectively separable, compact. To see this it suffices to consider the trivial examples $\mathcal{U} = \{\bar{B}\}$ and $X_n(\omega) = \bar{B}$, for $\omega \in \Omega$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\bar{B}$ denotes the closed unit ball in an infinite dimensional non-separable Banach space.

References

[1] Z. Artstein and J. C. Hansen, *Convexification in limit laws of random sets in Banach spaces*, Ann. Prob. **13** (1985), 307–309.

[2] Z. Artstein and R. A. Vitale, *A strong law of large numbers for random compact sets*, Ann. Prob. **3** (1975), 879–882.

[3] R. Aumann, *Integrals of set valued functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **12** (1965), 1–12.

[4] G. Beer, *Topologies on closed and convex sets*, Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 268, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993.

[5] C. Castaing and M. Valadier, *Convex analysis and measurable multifunctions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 580, Springer- Verlag, Berlin, 1977.

[6] N. Cressie, *Strong limit theorem for random sets*, Suppl. Adv. Appl. Prob. **10** (1978), 36–46.

[7] J. Diestel and J.J. Jr. Uhl, *Vector measures*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1967.

[8] C. Hess, *Théorème ergodique et loi forte des grands nombres pour les ensembles aléatoires*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. A-B **288** (1979), 519–522.

[9] C. Hess, *The distribution of unbounded random sets and the multivalued strong law of large numbers in nonreflexive Banach spaces*, J. Convex Anal. **6** (1999), 163–182.

[10] F. Hiai, *Strong law of large numbers for multivalued random variables*, Multifunctions and Integrals (G. Salinetti, ed.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1091, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984, pp. 160–172.

[11] E. Hille and RS Phillips, *Functional analysis and semi-groups*, Colloquium Publications, Vol. 31, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1957.

[12] S. Hu and N. S. Papageorgiou, *Handbook of multivalued analysis, Vol. I, II*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1997.

[13] M. Hukuhara, *Integration des applications mesurables dont la valeur est un compact convexe*, Funkcial. Ekvac. **10** (1967), 205–223.

[14] K. Kuratowski, *Topology, Vol. I*, Academic Press, New York, 1966.

[15] K. Kuratowski and C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *A general theorem on selectors*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys **13** (1965), 397–403.

[16] I. Molchanov, *Theory of random sets*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[17] U. Mosco, *Convergence of convex sets and of solutions of variational inequalities*, Advances in Math. **3** (1969), 510–585.

[18] E. Mourier, *L-random elements and L*-random elements in Banach spaces*, Proc. third Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. and Prob., University of California Press, 1956, pp. 231–242.

[19] M. L. Puri and D. A. Ralescu, *Strong law of large numbers for Banach spaces valued random sets*, Ann. Prob. **11** (1983), 222–224.

[20] M. L. Puri and D. A. Ralescu, *Limit theorems for random compact sets in Banach spaces*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phyl. Soc. **97** (1985), 151–158.

[21] H. Rådström, *An embedding theorem for spaces of convex sets*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **3** (1952), 165–169.

[22] R.L. Taylor, *Stochastic convergence of weighted sums of random elements in linear spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 672, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1978.

[23] P. Terán and I. Molchanov, *The law of large numbers in a metric space with a convex combination operation*, J. Theor. Prob. **19** (2006), 875–898.

[24] R.A. Wijsman, *Convergence of sequences of convex sets, cones and functions. II*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **123** (1966), 32–45.